REMARKS

In light of the new claims above and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are solicited.

Please note that this case was unintentionally abandoned. A Petition to Revive is attached.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action of January 13, 2000 which issued herein and submits this amendment in response thereto. New claims are submitted.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being unpatentable over Davis et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,822,123. Additionally, claims 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis. Claims 1-8 have been canceled. New claims 9-26 are submitted. Claims 9, 15, 19, and 22 are independent. It is respectfully submitted that the newly submitted claims are patentable over the art of record.

Davis shows a system whereby a user can enter a content-specific channel navigation mode. A user employing the Davis device uses the channel navigation arrow keys on a controller to navigate sequentially all available channels (i.e., up/down). However, if a user wishes to watch programming displaying a particular type of content, i.e., news, sports, drama, etc., the user depresses a content-specific button on the controller, or enters into a content-specific mode using a Davis EPG, thereby

locking the channel navigational system into a content-specific channel navigation mode. A typical Davis controller will have many content-specific buttons, one for each available content-specific mode (i.e., a news mode button, a sports mode button, etc.). In this content-specific mode, normal channel navigation is disrupted. The user still uses the same channel-navigation arrow keys as previously used to navigate all available channels. However, while in the content-specific mode, all channels not displaying a desired content will be automatically filtered, thereby hiding them from the user during navigation. The user can navigate only the channels containing the selected content using the up/down keys as are used in the sequential navigation. The device remains in this mode until the user exits this content specific mode.

New independent claim 9 is patentable over Davis. The Applicant respectfully submits that Davis does not show displaying "the at least one content-related channel in response to a second control signal, wherein the second control signal is different from the first control signal." In Davis, all channel navigation, whether content-specific, or numerically sequential, is done using the same signal received from the same channel-navigation arrow keys. A Davis controller may also have many content-specific buttons. However, these buttons are not used for channel navigation. They are used to enter a content-specific channel navigation mode (i.e., the activate a filter based on content). Once a specific button is depressed, the EPG displays channels having content in that particular category. Davis also discloses placing the TV's tuner into a content specific mode through the navigation of a television EPG, which performs the same function as the content specific buttons.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Davis does not suggest or describe new independent claim 9. New independent claims 15, 19, and 22 contain similar limitations. Further, since claims 10-14, 16-18, 20-21, and 23-26 depend from and further define and limit independent claims 9, 15, 19, and 22, it is submitted that the dependant claims are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

New dependant claim 12 also contains patentable subject matter. Claim 12 requires that the step of "displaying the at least one content-related channel in response to a second control signal... occurs without an intervening command." Davis requires a user to enter a content specific mode, in which regular channel navigation is restricted. The user must then exit the content specific mode before resuming normal sequential surfing of all available channels. While in the content specific mode, all channels with dissimilar content are unavailable to the user through the channel navigation arrows. A Davis user who wishes to transition from the content-restricted mode to a normal mode must press an intervening key to shift modes. This key either activates or de-activates the filter. This key does not provide a navigational signal.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Davis does not suggest or describe new dependant claim 12. As new dependant claims 13, 17, 20, 23 and 24 contain similar limitations as new claim 12, it is respectfully submitted that they are also in a condition for allowance.

New dependant claim 14 also includes patentable subject matter. Claim 14 requires "navigating from a first content-related channel of said at least one channel to a second content-related channel of said at least one second channel in response to said second control signal." As discussed above, the content-specific switch of Davis is not a navigational switch. Davis's content specific switches are used only to activate and de-activate the content based navigational filter.

Therefore it is respectfully submitted that Davis does not suggest or describe new dependant claims 14. As new dependant claims 18, 21, and 26 contain similar limitations it is respectfully submitted that they are also in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the present application is now in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The undersigned attorney requests that the Examiner contact him at the telephone number indicated below to resolve any remaining issues raised herein so that an Examiner's amendment may be utilized as appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP Attorney for Applicant(s) /

By_

Anthony C. Coles Reg. No. 34,139

Date: August 10, 2001

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP 1585 Broadway New York, NY 10036-8299

Telephone: (212) 969-3000

FAX COPY RECEIVED

AUG 1 0 2001

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800